

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/819,036	VIRTANEN, JORMA A.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jonathan ML Foreman	3736	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jonathan ML Foreman.

(2) Drew S. Hamilton.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 6 August 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*Double patenting rejection made 11/5/02.*

**Claims discussed:**

*21 and 22*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During the interview the Examiner pointed out that claims 21 and 22 were cancelled in the amendment filed 4/16/03. However, claims 21 and 22 were inadvertently placed back in with the petition filed 5/24/04. Applicant agreed to cancel claims 21 and 22 to overcome the double patenting rejection made 11/5/02..